DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 760

SP 039 286

AUTHOR Hess, Elisabeth K.

TITLE The Facilitators of and the Barriers to the Collaboration Process in PDSs.

PUB DATE 2000-04-28

NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Administrators; Case Studies; *College School Cooperation; Educational Change; Educational Resources; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Higher Education; Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; Rewards; School Districts; Space Utilization; *Teacher Collaboration; Teacher Improvement; Time Management

IDENTIFIERS Barriers to Innovation; Meta Ethnography

ABSTRACT

This study identified facilitators of and barriers to collaboration in Professional Development Schools (PDSs). Researchers conducted a meta-ethnography, which synthesized qualitative research and attempted to analyze processes and outcomes across many studies. Case studies of the collaboration process in PDSs were collected and screened, then themes were coded and interpreted. A literature search yielded 66 case studies. After screening, 20 case studies remained. Each case study was analyzed in terms of geographic region, type of partnership, urban or suburban setting, number of years in the partnership, and authors. Facilitators of the collaboration process that were interpreted from the 20 case studies were: obtaining needed resources from outside organizations; administrative support, taking time to establish a shared vision; and the feeling that PDSs increase professional development. Barriers to collaboration included time, lack of rewards, the change process, district mandates, and space. The paper presents six recommendations to practitioners, schools, and teacher education institutions for beginning and sustaining a PDS. (Contains 56 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 442 760

The Facilitators of and the Barriers to the Collaboration Process in PDSs.

Elisabeth K. Hess
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP039286

E.K. Hess

2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Introduction

In recent decades, teacher education has been sharply criticized for its inability to train teachers for the realities of today's schools (Darling-Hammond, 1996; Goodlad, 1984; 1990; 1994; Sarason, 1993). Published reports of various reformers propose an extensive overhaul of programs for teacher education (Goodlad, 1984; 1990; 1994; Holmes Group, 1986; 1990; 1995; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future 1996). Common to each of these reports is the call for university-school partnerships.

Professional Development Schools (PDSs) are collaborative mergers between universities and school sites. According to the Holmes Partnership, PDSs are schools that serve teacher education as the teaching hospital serves medical education, and as agricultural extension services serve the agricultural community (Holmes Group, 1990). Across the nation, PDS reform efforts are projected to resolve two significant problems in the work of schools and universities. First, schools will be revitalized and transform out-of-date practices. Second, new teachers will become better teachers because they experience sustained interaction between schools and universities (Zimpher, 1990). PDSs have become a major initiative in the reform and restructuring movement in public education and are intended to reform education through the development of simultaneous renewal between partner schools and universities (Bullough, Hobbs, Kauchak, Crow, & Stokes, 1997; Goodlad, 1990; Holmes 1990).

A critical aspect in the formation and maintenance of a PDS is the collaboration process between the university and the school (Dixon & Ishler, 1992). Creating and maintaining PDSs, according to many accounts, is difficult due to the fusing and

restructuring of two existing organizations (Berry & Catoe, 1994; Murray, 1993; Neufeld, 1992; Snyder, 1994; Stoddart, 1993). The collaboration process between universities and schools often yields tensions, dilemmas, and unanswered critical questions (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Levine, 1997; Metcalf-Turner, 1996). Without collaboration between schools and universities, the goals of a PDS cannot be formed, implemented, sustained, or evaluated.

This study was designed to identify the facilitators of and the barriers to the collaboration process in PDSs. The following sections describe the methodology used to complete this research, the identified facilitators to the collaboration process in PDSs, the identified barriers to the collaboration process in PDSs, and recommendations to practitioners involved or considering involvement in PDSs.

Methodology

The available literature about the collaboration process in PDSs consists of mostly descriptive and conceptual studies. These studies often describe in detail the relationship between a school and a university (Book, 1996; Kochan, 1996; 1998; 1999; Murray 1996). It is notable that there are no integrative studies about the collaboration process across case studies. In order to better understand the collaboration process in PDSs, the numerous qualitative case studies describing the collaboration process in individual sites need to be integrated.

Research design

Meta-ethnography is a structured way to synthesize qualitative research and attempts to see processes and outcomes across many case studies (Noblit & Hare, 1988). Cross-case or multiple case analysis is an important research process because it creates

generalizability for qualitative studies and deepens understanding and explanation of a studied phenomenon (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; 1970; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Ragin, 1987; Silverstein, 1988). Meta-ethnography attempts to both preserve the uniqueness of qualitative inquiry and entail comparison (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The phases for conducting a meta-ethnography according to Noblit and Hare (1988) are: (a) getting started, (b) deciding what is relevant to the researcher, (c) reading the studies, (d) determining how the studies are related, (e) translating the studies into one another, (f) synthesizing the translations, and (g) expressing the synthesis (see Table 1).

Table 1:

The process of completing a meta-ethnography

Phase	Title	Steps for this study
Phase 1	*Getting Started*	The area of interest is the PDS movement and the collaboration process in PDSs.
Phase 2	*Deciding what is relevant to the researcher*	Case studies that describe the collaboration process in PDSs are of interest. These case studies must be particularistic to collaboration, be descriptive, capable of interpretation, and provide details. In addition, the case studies must have explicit research questions, describe data collection procedures, and provide adequate findings.
Phase 3	*Reading the studies*	Themes were collected while reading the case studies based upon the researcher's interpretations of the data.
Phase 4	*Determining how the studies are related*	Themes were identified and compared while reading each case study.
Phase 5	*Translating the studies into each other*	Similarities, differences and unusual information in the case studies were combined across case studies.
Phase 6	*Synthesizing the translations*	The commonalities of the themes were analyzed and synthesized. These themes were examined within the context of literature on inter-organizational relationships and the facilitators of and the barriers to the collaboration process were identified.
Phase 7	*Expressing the synthesis*	The results of the analysis were written.

In order to complete a metaethnography about the collaboration process in PDSs, this researcher collected case studies of the collaboration process in PDSs, screened the

studies, coded the themes, and then interpreted the themes. A literature search revealed 66 case studies of collaboration in PDSs. Each of the 66 case studies found in journal articles, books, and dissertations was recorded on the sample selection grid. The grid was then sent to three expert panelists who were known to have knowledge about the breadth and depth of the literature on collaboration in PDSs. The expert panel endorsed the selected case studies and then suggested the inclusion of two case studies. After the case studies were collected they were screened for content and for methodological rigor. Of the 66 identified case studies about the collaboration process in PDSs there were 55 case studies that met the first screen, the content criteria (Merriam 1988; 1998). The case studies were then examined and evaluated using a methodological criteria devised by Rist (1999). After testing each proposed case study against these criteria, 20 studies were selected for study. These 20 studies were read and coded using open and axial coding methods.

Sample

Once the sample was selected, each case study was analyzed in terms of the following demographic information: (a) geographic region, (b) type of partnership, (c) urban or suburban setting, (d) the number of years in the partnership, and (e) the authors of the study. Of the 20 case studies chosen for this study, 3 PDSs were from the Northeast, 3 were from the Southeast, 6 were from the Midwest, 2 were from the West Coast, and 6 were from the West. In the second category, the type of partnership, the PDSs were categorized by whether or not the partners were in public or private institutions. In the identified sample, 15 PDSs were public university and public school partnerships, 4 were private university and public school partnerships, and 1 was a

private university and private school partnership. It is notable that only one school was a private school.

The third demographic category was the identification of the PDSs setting. This category described the place the university and the school were located. The setting is described in terms of urban, suburban, or rural areas. In the sample there were 15 urban universities, 3 suburban universities, 1 rural university, and 1 unidentified university. There were also 25 urban schools, 8 suburban schools, and 2 rural schools discussed within all the case studies. The case studies often identified more than one school in partnership with the university. In addition, there was no differentiation made between the size of each urban area.

The number of years the partnerships were in existence was also recorded for each selected case study. The mean number of years of the existence of the PDSs in this sample was 3.8 years. There was 1 PDS in existence for 1 year, 2 for 2 years, 6 PDSs in existence for 3 years, 4 for 4 years, 2 for 5 years, 3 for 6 years, 1for 8 years, and one unknown. The final category in the description of the sample was the identification of the author of the case study. Ten of the case studies were written exclusively by university faculty, 6 by graduate students, and 4 by school personnel and university faculty members. It is notable that the majority of the case studies were written by university faculty members and may therefore only reflect their perspective of the collaboration process in PDSs.

Facilitators of the collaboration process

Through the process of the meta-ethnography this researcher identified several themes about the facilitators of the collaboration process in PDSs. The facilitators of the

collaboration process that were interpreted from the 20 case studies were: (a) obtaining needed resources from outside organizations, (b) administrative support, (c) taking time to establish a shared vision, and (d) the feeling that a PDS increases professional development. The following paragraphs discuss each of these identified facilitators.

Obtaining resources from outside organizations

One facilitator of the collaboration process in PDSs was obtaining resources from outside organizations. In order to support the collaboration process, many PDSs in this study obtained funding from a variety of sources outside their school or university program. Many of schools in the case studies obtained needed resources through writing grants or forging partnerships with local businesses or organizations. The attainment of funding allowed the partners to establish and maintain a PDS. Some university and school faculty members wrote grants with states, the federal government, and unions to obtain the necessary funding for a PDS (Grossman, 1994; Lemlech, Hertzog-Foliart, & Hackl, 1994; McKendall, 1998; Miller & Silvernail, 1994). One PDS acquired venture capital from private businesses. Similarly a western, public, urban PDS forged a partnership with a local non-profit corporation (Kutcher-Lopez, 1995). Through acquiring funding from a variety of outside sources, PDSs were able to begin and sustain the collaboration process.

Administrative support

Another facilitator of the collaboration process in PDSs was the existence of administrative support for the PDS. Supportive deans and school district central offices were described as facilitators of the collaboration process in 7 of the 20 studies. Deans who proved supportive of the PDS advocated for the model and participated in the

planning and implementation of new PDSs. The central school administration facilitated the collaboration process in PDSs through devoting resources to the partnerships. These supportive administrators aided the PDS process through recognizing the work in PDSs, participating in the PDS, and through finding funds or other resources for the PDSs to use.

Supportive university deans facilitated the process of collaboration through showing their support for the PDS through their presence, expectations, and attempts to reward PDS participation. For example, a dean of a college of education in a mid-western, public, university "... set up monthly breakfast meetings. They met throughout the year to talk about education issues and worked to better understand each other," (McKendall , 1998, p. 92).

School administrators facilitated the collaboration process in PDSs. Through participating in the PDS effort and devoting specific resources to the partnerships. Members of a mid-western, public, rural PDS felt that, "The superintendent and board have been supportive of the PDS partnership initiatives even as they continue to support the district's more traditional field experience arrangements," (Conrath, 1997, p.110) . Another PDS felt similarly. A member of a northeastern public, urban PDS said, "Central office directors and curriculum coordinators have been instrumental in facilitating the collaboration between the university and the school district," (Perkins, 1991, p. 73).

Taking time to establish a shared vision

Another facilitator of the collaboration process in PDSs was taking the time to establish a shared vision for the partnership. Twelve of the cases in this study reported

having various meetings where committees and partners created a shared vision of the purpose and goals of the PDS (Breck, 1994; Clift, Veal, Holland, Johnson, & McCarthy, 1995; Feezell, 1997; Grossman, 1994; Kirschner, Dickinson & Blosser, Kutcher-Lopez, 1995; McKendall, 1998; Perkins, 1991; Rose, 1994; Slater, 1996; Snyder, 1994; Snyder & Goldman, 1997). Many of these meetings resulted in the creation of mission statements that provided focused goals for the PDSs (Clift, Veal, Holland, Johnson, & McCarthy, 1995). Without taking the time to establish trust, rapport, and similar goals and objectives, the collaboration process in PDSs became more strained.

The feeling that a PDS increases professional development

Another facilitator of the collaboration process in PDSs is the feeling that a PDS increases the professional development of educators. Through experiencing professional growth, teachers and teacher educators are more satisfied with the PDS program and more willing to keep working in the PDS. This facilitated the collaboration between the university and the school. Some teachers in the PDS felt satisfied having interns while others grew in professional development seminars sponsored by the project. One teacher in a northeastern, public, urban PDS commented:

> I think it was good for me to be observed by the interns. It made my teaching better because I knew there was another adult in the classroom who was watching me and talking about me later, so it made me really want to get prepared even more, and it develops good habits. When someone is there watching you everyday, then you're a lot more critical. (Miller & Silvernail, 1994, p.43).

Teachers that met together as a result of the PDS partnership developed support networks. Taking charge of their own professional development furthered the continual learning goal of the PDS. Professional development meetings facilitated the feeling of increased professional development and led to long-term teacher empowerment activities.

The growth of the teachers involved in a PDS encouraged one teacher to pursue an interest in PDS activities. This uninvolved teacher in a western, public, urban PDS recognized:

> All along the teachers were going to in-services, supposedly to become better teachers, to learn different methods or to better their methods. We didn't understand that. Now I kind of wish I had taken time out for the in-services even if it meant time away from my students. All those teachers seem to have such better teaching techniques than I or at they began to look at teaching differently. (Snyder & Goldman, 1997, p.251).

The feeling that PDSs increase the professional development of teachers and the support of informal meetings facilitated the collaboration process. Active participants were encouraged to continue PDS work and future cooperating teachers were motivated to become involved.

Summary

The facilitators of the collaboration process in this study were identified as (a) obtaining resources from outside organizations, (b) administrative support, (c) taking time to establish a shared vision, and (d) the feeling that a PDS increases professional development. The case studies in this meta-ethnography identified these facilitators as critical and necessary to the collaboration process in PDSs. The following table, Table 2, summarized the identified facilitators and the number of cases that were coded as facilitators of the collaboration process.

The identified facilitators in this study were clearly identified in the case studies as incidents or happenings that helped the collaboration process in PDSs. It is notable that each of the case studies that identified these facilitators was identified as a study that was methodologically sound. These identified facilitators are identified across case studies and in rigorous qualitative case studies.

Table 2

Facilitators of the collaboration process in PDSs

Identified facilitator	**Description of the facilitator**	**Number and percent of cases identifying the facilitator**
Obtaining resources from outside organizations	In order to fund the PDS, many case studies utilized outside funding sources.	10 of 20 (50%)
Administrative support	When deans of colleges of education and the school administration supported the PDS, the collaboration process was aided.	7 of 20 (35%)
Taking the time to establish a shared vision	PDSs identified the benefit of taking the time to establish common goals and a shared vision in the PDS.	16 of 20 (80%)
Feeling that a PDS increases professional development	Teachers identified the benefit of working with university students and faculty members and were encouraged to continue the PDS process.	9 of 20 (45%)

Barriers to the collaboration process

The barriers that were identified in this study will be presented in descending order from the most frequently cited barrier to the least cited barrier. The barriers to the collaboration process identified in this study were: (a) time, (b) lack of rewards, (c) the

change process, (d) district mandates, and (e) space. Each barrier will be presented with examples from the case studies.

Time

In this study, the most frequently cited barrier to the collaboration process in PDSs was the barrier of time. Both university faculty members and school faculty members identified limited time as a barrier to the collaboration process. Time became a barrier in PDSs because teachers and professors have busy schedules and because the university and the school have different schedules.

Time is a barrier in the collaboration process for teachers because teachers have such complex roles. The roles of teachers and teacher educators demand intensive time commitments. These roles do not leave much time for collaboration. The following examples from the case studies exemplify the intensive roles of PDS members. One southeastern, public, urban, elementary PDS member stated:

> Follow-up meetings have been difficult to arrange due to overloaded work schedules and the lack of time. As one teacher commented about the lack of site-level progress, 'We have just not been able to find the time for a group of teachers, the university faculty member, and the principal to meet,' (Berry & Catoe, 1994, p. 180).

Another member from a southeastern, public, suburban PDS agreed and gave examples of why time is so scarce for teachers. She stated:

> Because of the number of outside demands, such as coaching, tutoring, or advising clubs, one of the major problems for the team was finding time to meet. Meetings were held before and after school, often with individual members absent or leaving halfway through discussions. (Clift, Veal, Holland, Johnson, & McCarthy, 1995, p. 72).

University faculty members also experienced time as a barrier to their work. The time intensive nature of PDS work demanded that the faculty members restructure their

time to be able to work with teachers. This extended their work time. One member of a mid-western, public, urban PDS reported:

> Professors, too, have time limitations. For example, they are allotted a prescribed amount of time (i.e. access to the students' time) for each course and field experience. While professors may have a more flexible schedule than that of teacher instructors, the re-structuring of their duties that result from their participation in the PDS generally increases the time and energy required to deliver classes and supervise field experiences. (Rose, 1994, p. 490).

Struggling to do collaborative work while also trying to manage all the other intensive duties in a school can lead individuals to feel tired and drained. One member of a western, public, urban PDS commented:

> Lack of time, as always, inhibited the relationship. Realistically there just aren't enough hours in a day to plan lessons, gather materials, teach, advise student teachers, deal with children's special problems, meet with their parents, attend PDS meetings and take on a myriad of PDS assignments. Your energy wanes after a while. Then your will weakens and you start feeling frustrated and defensive about all the things you haven't done. You forget all the good things you have accomplished. (Snyder & Goldman, 1997, p.242).

In addition to the busy schedules of professors and teachers, commute times and calendars also interfered with quality time to collaborate (Breck, 1994). Schools and universities also manage their time differently. Employees in the schools have a different calendar than the university. Some schools even have different calendars for different teachers. Through conflicting schedules, time for collaboration was diminished. Time can be a significant barrier to the collaboration process in PDSs. In order to have a PDS, members must be able to communicate and make joint decisions. The intensity of the role of school based faculty members limited the available time to collaborate. In addition, long commutes and different schedules and calendars complicated the process of finding time to work together.

Lack of rewards

The second most commonly identified barrier to the collaboration process in PDSs in these 20 case studies was the lack of rewards for PDS work. Both university professors and school faculty generally did not receive rewards or recognition from their separate organizations for PDS work. University faculty struggled with the demands of the university and publishing while school faculty struggled with little compensation or planning time awarded to them as a result of their increased duties.

University faculty members, especially faculty without tenure, were generally not rewarded for their participation in PDSs. Faculty who do work with PDSs dedicate much of their time to the school. This led to complications in the university structure (Berry & Catoe, 1994; Breck, 1994). School faculty members also have difficulty attaining rewards for their work in PDSs. Some teachers in this study were given extra planning time or compensation for their time. Other teachers participated in PDSs without being rewarded. In a case study of a western, public, urban PDS the author noted:

> In schools, teachers and administrators are not rewarded. They need time, recognition and resources for engaging in inquiry and school based research. (Button, Ponticell, & Johnson, 1996, p.4).

Both university and school faculty encountered the barrier of rewards in their PDS work. The university did not credit faculty members seeking tenure for PDS work and school systems generally did not give teachers extra time or money for their contributions. The nature of PDS work is complex and intensive. Without recognition or compensation to individuals, PDS work becomes a burden to dedicated individuals in universities or schools.

Change

Another barrier identified in this study was the process of change. PDSs form new organizations in schools. This process of forming new organizations forces change to occur. The case studies identified the slow pace of the change process as well as the innate resistance to change as a barrier to the collaboration process (Conrath, 1997; Perkins, 1991). Patience is needed during the slow process of PDS work. The effort and time do not produce immediate benefits. A PDS member in a northeastern, public, urban middle school stated:

> Change was difficult and continues to be so. The PDS project has not changed the world of teacher education or professionalized the career of teaching. It has taken much time, much energy, and it has not always been fun. (Snyder, 1994, p.124).

District mandates

Another frequently identified barrier to the collaboration process in PDSs in this study was district mandates. Often district mandates compete with the goals of the PDS and with the time dedicated to the collaboration process. Districts and states mandate standardized testing and teacher evaluations that require focused teacher attention. One member of a southeastern, public, suburban PDS said:

> Without question, the PDS educators are pressured by the state and district mandated high stakes basic skills, standardized achievement testing...The issue here is not just hard working educators doing too much, but also competing policy initiatives that do not share a common view of teaching. (Berry & Catoe, 1994, p. 185).

Many mandates stress basic skills while universities often stress constructivist theories about learning. In addition, some districts in this study were requiring different teaching competencies than were being utilized in the PDS. This affects the PDS because the student teachers must adhere to the district teacher evaluation system rather than to the suggestions of their university supervisors

In one PDS the principal attempted to shield her teachers from other district mandates. Trying to stay focused on the PDS effort the principal risked her job for the teachers. One member of this southeastern, public, urban PDS said, "This is such a large district where state and local mandates are frequent. In this case, the principal has attempted to buffer the outside mandates," (Clift, Veal, Holland, Johnson, & McCarthy, 1995, p.60).

Another way that district and state mandates were a barrier to the collaboration process in PDSs is through their control of the finances for the PDS. When teachers or university faculty members suggest changes, the district and state have the power to support the plan or not (Lemlech, Hertzog-Foliart, & Hackl, 1994).

Space

Another identified barrier to the collaboration process in PDSs was the issue of space. The case studies that identified space as an issue in the partnership usually did so in the initial phase of the collaboration process. Schools and universities had to negotiate where classes and meetings were to be held and where the university liaisons could work. Often the school administrator would solve the issue of finding space for the partnership while other times the university offered its facilities for meetings (Clift, Veal, Holland, Johnson, & McCarthy, 1995; Pasch & Pugach, 1990). One PDS had the luxury of constructing its own building in order to remedy the issue of limited space for the PDS partnership. In their consideration of space the leadership team was able to plan for collaboration (Slater, 1996). Another case study did not solve the problem of finding a space for the partnership and the effects were detrimental to the collaboration process (Snyder, 1994).

Summary

The barriers to the collaboration process in PDSs in this study were identified as: (a) time, (b) lack of rewards, (c) the change process, (d) district mandates, and (e) space. The following table, Table 3, summarizes the identified barriers.

Table 3

Barriers to the collaboration process in PDSs

Identified barrier	**Description of the barrier**	**Number and percentage of cases identifying the barrier**
Time	Both university and school faculty identified limited time as an impediment to collaboration	17 of 20 (85%)
Lack of rewards	University faculty members do not usually benefit in the tenure process working in PDSs. In addition, school faculty doing more work without compensation or recognition.	13 of 20 (65%)
The change process	The change process is slow and frustrates PDS participants.	12 of 20 (60%)
District mandates	School districts mandate standardized testing and funding arrangements that interfere with PDSs.	6 of 20 (30%)
Space	Especially in the initial stages of the partnership, the lack of space to meet impedes collaboration.	6 of 20 (30%)

Many of these identified barriers in this study can be found in the conceptual literature about PDSs. However, these barriers were identified in studies that were evaluated

methodologically. It is interesting to note the frequency of these barriers across the various case studies. This study illustrates the prevalence of these barriers across this sample of case studies. Additionally, these barriers were clearly identified in the qualitative studies and the demographics of the PDS did not affect identified barriers in this study.

Recommendations

The following seven recommendations are given to practitioners in schools and in teacher education institutions so that the PDS reform movement can be better understood and sustained. The recommendations, based upon the findings of this study, are categorized into (a) beginning a PDS, and (b) sustaining a PDS. Recommendations one through three apply to beginning the collaboration process in PDSs while recommendations four through seven apply to sustaining the collaboration process in PDSs.

Recommendation 1: Beginning a PDS

The first recommendation for practitioners in PDSs is to establish a PDS with a school and a university where there is administrative support for the partnership. The findings of this study were that the PDSs in this sample identified the support of deans and administrators outside the PDS as a facilitator to the collaboration process. Deans of colleges of education and school administrators must support the PDS if the PDS is to operate and be sustained. One way deans and administrators outside of the PDS can show their support is through creating a reward structure for university and school faculty involved in the PDS. An identified barrier to the collaboration process in the findings of of this study is the lack of reward in PDS work. This identified barrier suggests that

participation is limited in PDSs because neither universities nor school systems reward their PDS participants. The tenure system in universities needs to recognize PDS work as viable and worthy of merit. In addition, teachers who are giving their time to train other teachers need to be compensated and recognized for their contributions to the teaching profession. Another way deans and outside administrators can show their administrative support for the PDS is through evaluating their district's mandates and their effects on the PDS. District mandates for standardized testing and teacher evaluation were identified in this study as a barrier to the collaboration process. Teachers had so many demands placed upon them that the district mandates interfered with the time and energy they could devote to reforming their practices and helping other new teachers. Administrative support is needed in PDSs. This support could be manifested in establishing a reward system and in eliminating competing district mandates.

A facilitator of the collaboration process in PDSs in this study and in the literature is administrative support; in other words support from university deans and school central office administrators (Goodlad, 1994; Hayes, Camilli, & Piazza, 1997). PDSs should only be established where the administrators in both organizations are supportive and where both organizations are required to reward PDS participants.

Recommendation 2: Beginning a PDS

The second recommendation for practitioners in PDSs is to utilize outside resources to sustain funding. The findings of this study identified the utilization of outside resources as facilitators to the collaboration process in PDSs. When beginning a partnership it is imperative to secure adequate funding to cover the costs of the PDS. In addition, attention should be paid to how funding will be sustained in the PDS (Abdal-

Haqq, 1998; Clark, 1997). A plan for securing funding initially and longitudinally should be established. The case studies in this meta-ethnography reported success in writing grants and partnering with other organizations to secure funding. However, these case studies also recommended seeking sustained funding because of the stress of securing annual funding strained the collaboration process.

Recommendation 3: Beginning a PDS

The third recommendation for practitioners in PDSs is to take the time needed to build a shared vision of the PDS in the beginning of the partnership. Time is a barrier to the collaboration process in PDSs. There is limited time for university faculty members, school administrators, and teachers to meet, plan, and discuss PDS issues. However, a facilitator to the collaboration process in PDSs in this study was taking the time to establish a shared vision. PDSs in this metaethnography reported the benefit of making time for vision building and for goal setting. This study found that PDSs that developed consensus and shared goals felt positive about their collaborative efforts. PDS participants need to understand before beginning the partnership that time is scarce and that special arrangements will need to be made to conduct meetings, retreats, or seminars that build consensus and goals for the PDS. Time is scarce but the taking the time to establish shared goals should be required in PDSs.

Recommendation 4: Sustaining a PDS

Once PDSs have been established, there are important steps that need to be taken to insure that the PDS continues. The following recommendations illustrate important components of sustaining partnerships based upon the findings of this study.

The fourth recommendation for practitioners in PDSs is to conduct relational or interpersonal training sessions with PDS participants in order to strengthen individual communication, listening, and organizational skills. PDSs demand that individuals collaborate and interact frequently with each other. In order to improve these interactions, participants need to be provided with interpersonal instruction. The skills of collaboration and of relations must be presented, analyzed, and discussed by PDS participants so that individuals are not relying solely on their personal instincts. Some skills that could be included in this training include listening skills, understanding group processes, personality inventories, how to build consensus, organizational skills, and time management skills. Both university faculty members and school faculty members in a PDS need instruction in order to better their relationships.

Recommendation 5: Sustaining a PDS

The fifth recommendation for practitioners in PDSs is to encourage teachers and university faculty to build their skills and participate in their own professional development. In this study, the teachers who enjoyed learning from the university students felt encouraged about the partnership and were more eager to participate in PDSs. An identified facilitator across the case studies was the feeling that a PDS increases professional development. The university and the teachers should work together to develop meaningful professional development activities for each other. Professional development activities were well received when the teachers helped to direct the activities and meetings.

Recommendation 6: Sustaining a PDS

The sixth and final recommendation for practitioners in PDSs based upon the findings of this study is to have informal meetings and gatherings to establish trust and camaraderie in the PDS. In this study it was noted that special meetings such as brown bag lunches, retreats, dinners, conferences and informal dinners assisted the trust-building process in PDSs. Trust building activities between all members of the PDS needs to occur and can be best facilitated through informal meetings and social gatherings. It is recommended that PDS members consistently meet informally in order to build strong relationships.

References

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Berry, B. & Catoe, S. (1994). Creating professional development schools: Policy and practice in South Carolina's Initiatives. In L. Darling-Hammond's (Ed.) Professional Development Schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press, 176-201.

Book, C.L. (1996). Professional development schools. In J. Sikula, T.J Buttery & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed.) New York: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.

Breck, S. (1988). Implementing professional development schools: Seeking a shared vision. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas.

Bullough, R.V., Hobbs, S.F., Kauchack, D.P., Crow, N.A., Stokes, D. (1997). Long-Term PDS development in research universities and the clinicalization of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education 48(2), 85-95.

Button, K., Ponticell, J. & Johnson, M. (1996). Enabling school-university collaborative research: Lessons learned in professional development schools. Journal of Teacher Education, 42(1), 16-20.

Clark, R.W. (1997). Professional development schools: Policy and financing. A guide for policymakers. Washington DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Clift, R. R. and Say, M. (1988). Teacher Education: Collaboration or conflict? Journal of Teacher Education, 39(1), 2-7.

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.). (1994). Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). What matters most: A competent teacher for every child. Phi Delta Kappan78 (3), 193-202.

Dixon, P. & Ishler, R. (1992). Professional development schools: Stages in collaboration. Journal of Teacher Education 43(1), 28-34.

Feezell, B. (1996). One site's beginning: Developing a university-partner school relationship as a member of the Nebraska Network for Educational Renewal. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitat Green, N., Baldini, B. & Stack, W.M. (1993, Summer). Spanning cultures: Teachers and professors in professional development schools (pp. 24-39). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Pressive research. Chicago: Aldine.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A.L. (1970). Discovery of substantive theory. In W. Filstead (Ed.), Qualitative methodology (pp. 288-297). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. (1994). Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Green, N., Baldini, B. & Stack, W.M. (1993, Summer). Spanning cultures: Teachers and professors in professional development schools (pp. 24-39). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Grossman, P. (1994) In L. Darling-Hammond's (Ed.) Professional Development Schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press, 50-73.

Hayes, C., Camilli, V. & Piazza, J. (1997). Walking the walk: School/university collaboration in teacher education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (Chicago, March 24-28, 1997).

Holmes Group, (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Holmes Group, (1990). Tomorrow's School: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, Inc.

Holmes Group, (1995). Tomorrow's schools of education. East Lansing, MI; Author.

Kochan, F. (1996). Problems, solutions and benefits of professional development schools as perceived by university faculty. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the mid-south regional educational research association, Tuscaloosa, AL November 6-8,1996.

Kochan, F. (1998). Benefits of professional development schools: The hidden message in the forest. The Professional Educator 20(3), 1-6.

Kochan, F. (1999). Professional development schools: A comprehensive view. ATE 1999 Annual Yearbook.

Kirschner, B., Dickinson, R. & Blosser, C. (1996). From cooperation to collaboration: The changing culture of a school/university partnership. Theory into Practice, 35(3), 205-213.

Kutcher-Lopez, J. (1995). The emergence of an inner-city professional development school: A case study. Unpublished dissertation. University of North Texas.

Lemlech, J., Hertzog-Foliart, H., Hackl, A. (1994). In L. Darling-Hammond's (Ed.) Professional Development Schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press, 156-175.

Levine, M. (1997). Can professional development schools help us achieve what matters most? Action in Teacher Education 14 (2), 63-73.

McKendall, V. (1998). Factors affecting the success of interorganizational collaboration: Two cases at an urban high school. Unpublished dissertation. University of Minnesota.

Levine, M. (1997). Can professional development schools help us achieve what matters most? Action in Teacher Education 14 (2), 63-73.

Merriam, S. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Metcalf-Turner, P. (1996). Professional development schools: Persisting questions and lessons learned. Journal of Teacher Education 47(4), 292-295.

Miles, M. & Huberman, A. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Miller, L. & Silvernail, D. (1994). In L. Darling-Hammond's (Ed.) Professional Development Schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press, 28-49.

Murray, F.B. (1993). "All or none" criteria for professional development schools. In P.G. Altbach, H.G. Petrie, M.J. Shujaa, & L. Weis (Eds.), Educational policy: Volume 7,

Number1. Professional development schools (pp.61-73). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murray, F.B. (1996). The narrow and broad readings of tomorrow's schools of education. Educational Researcher, 25(5), 28-31.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996). What matters most: Teaching for America's future, Summary Report. New York: Harper-Collins.

Noblit, G. & Hare, R. (1988). Meta-ethnography: Synthesizing qualitative studies. Vol. 11, Newbury Park: Sage.

Neufeld, B.(1992). Professional practice schools in context: New mixtures of institutional authority. In M. Levine (Ed.), Professional practice schools: Linking teacher education and school reform (pp. 133-168). New York: Teachers College Press.

Osguthorpe, R., Harris, R., Fox-Harris, M, and Black, S. (Eds.) (1995). Partner schools: Centers for educational renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pasch, S. & Pugach, M. (1990). Collaborative planning for urban professional development schools. Contemporary Education, 61(3), 135- 143.

Perkins, M. (1991). The Fordham University intern fellowship program: A university and school district partnership. Unpublished dissertation. Fordham University.

Ragin, C.C. (1987). The comparative method: Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rist, R. (1999). (personal communication, April 9, 1999).

Rose, J. (1994). OTUS: The story of a school university partnership. Unpublished dissertation. Indiana University.

Sarason, S. (1995). School change: The personal development of a point of view. New York: Teachers College Press.

Silverstein, A. (1988). An Aristotelian resolution of the ideographic versus nomothetic tension. American Psychologist, 43(6), 425-430.

Slater, J. (1996). Anatomy of a collaboration: Study of a college of education/ public school partnership. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Snyder, J. (1994). Perils and potentials: A tale of two professional development schools. In L. Darling-Hammond's (Ed.) Professional Development Schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press, 98- 124.

Snyder, J. & Goldman (1997). . In M. Levine and R. Trachtman's (Eds.) Making professional development schools work: Politics, practices, and policy. New York: Teachers College Press.

Stoddart, T. (1993). The professional development school: Building bridges between cultures. In P.G. Altbach, H.G. Petrie, M. J. Shujaa, & L.Weiss (Eds.), Educational policy: Volume 7, Number 1. Professional development schools (pp. 5-23). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Winitzky, N., Stoddart, T. & O'Keefe, P. (1992). Great expectations: Emergent professional development schools. Journal of Teacher Education 43(1), 3-18.

Zimpher, N.(1990). Creating professional development school sites. Theory into Practice, 29(1), 42-49.